

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/164,580	ARNOLD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James M. Mitchell	2827	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James M. Mitchell.

(3) ____.

(2) Jay Cantor.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 08 July 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 22-31.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner indicated to applicant that it considered its supplemental appeal brief and was withdrawing its rejection and would indicate allowablity of claims 1-4, but that the application would only be allowed if applicant canceled claims 8, 9,13 and 14 based on newly discovered art and claims 22-31, because the claims were copied and therefore anticipated by Potter. Applicant declined to cancel claims and indicated that it was seeking an interference on claims 22-31. The current office action indicates the allowability of claims 1-4, rejects claims 8, 9, 13, 14 (new art) and 22-31 (Potter), as well as restates why an interference has been denied. .